

but does not disclose any calendering, bonding of undrawn fibers, or forming of spacers. Yamamoto does, however, state that the properties of the filter material is inferior if the undrawn fibers become crimped (col. 7, between Table 2 and Table 3). Calendering the filter material of Yamamoto through profiled calender rolls, as the examiner has said would be obvious in view of Norton, would likely result in crimping of the undrawn fibers. Yamamoto teaches directly away from the modification that the examiner states would be obvious to make in Yamamoto. The examiner's rejection is therefore erroneous, and must be withdrawn.

The examiner has asserted that Norton would make obvious calendering the filter material of Yamamoto between corrugated calender rolls. However, claim 1 requires that during the calendering process, the undrawn fibers be bonded. This is a feature taught in neither Yamamoto or Norton, or the other references (Meyer or Naruo et al.) cited by the examiner. Recognizing the deficiency of the prior art of record in teaching the claimed feature of bonding during calendering, the examiner has asserted that "it is reasonably taken that, in calendering the paper-like sheet material of Yamamoto et al. using a pair of profiled calender rolls, the fibrous web is bonded in a tension-free manner" The examiner's assertion of what is "reasonably taken" comes nowhere from the prior art, and instead is hindsight based on applicant's disclosure. Norton describes a process wherein a filter material is impregnated with a resin, and wherein the calendaring rolls are treated with a resin-solvent vapor. It is respectfully submitted that the process of Norton, which uses an injected resin material and calendar rolls which are modified so as to be usable with a resin-impregnated material are inapplicable to Yamamoto, and do not provide any form of teaching for bonding during the calendering process. The examiner has failed to provide any proper teaching, suggestion or motivation in any of the cited

prior art for this feature of claim 1, and therefore the rejection of claims 1-4 is improper and must be withdrawn.

The examiner's rejection of claims 2-3 is equally deficient. Those claims detail a preheating of the fibrous web and passing the web between heated or cooled calender rolls. The examiner has failed to demonstrate where in any of the prior art these features may be found. The best teaching, suggestion or motivation the examiner is able to proffer with regard to the features of claims 2-3 is that the fuse-bonding generically described in Yamamoto "would reasonably suggested to one in the art" the very detailed limitations in claims 2-3. It is respectfully submitted that Yamamoto does, in no way, teach or suggest any of the features of claims 2-3, and therefore the examiner's rejection of those claims is in error and must be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 is respectfully requested. Notice of allowance is now in order.

Dated: Aug. 27, 1999 By:


Richard L. Mayer (Reg. No.
22,490)


by P. McCoy Smith (Reg. No. 33,097)

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10004
(212) 425-7200 (telephone)
(212) 425-5288 (facsimile)

© Kenyon & Kenyon 1999